Review

Not peer-reviewed version

Dynamic Spine Stabilization Through Mechanically Tuned Constructs and Embedded Biomechanical Feedback Systems

Rahul Kumar , Kyle Sporn , Chirag Gowda , Phani Paladugu , Alnemri Alnemri , Akshay Khanna , Alex Ngo , Ram Jagadeesan , Ryung Lee , Louis Clarkson , Shashinath Chandrahasegowda , Tarikere Kumar , Nasif Zaman * , Alireza Tavakkoli

Posted Date: 20 May 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202505.1626.v1

Keywords: Dynamic spine stabilization; spinal implants; motion-preserving devices; low back pain treatment; smart sensors; flexible spine implants; spinal biomechanics; adaptive spine support; load-sensing devices

Review

Dynamic Spine Stabilization Through Mechanically Tuned Constructs and Embedded Biomechanical Feedback Systems

Rahul Kumar [1], Kyle Sporn [2], Chirag Gowda [1], Phani Paladugu [3,4], Ahab Alnemri [5], Akshay Khanna [4], Alex Ngo [1], Ram Jagadeesan [6,7], Ryung Lee [8], Louis Clarkson [9], Shashinath Chandrahasegowda [10], Tarikere Kumar [11], Nasif Zaman [12,*] and Alireza Tavakkoli [12]

[1] Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, Miami, Florida, United States
[2] Upstate Medical University Norton College of Medicine, Syracuse, New York, United States
[3] Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, United States
[4] Sidney Kimmel Medical College at Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, United States
[5] Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, United States
[6] Johns Hopkins Whiting School of Engineering, Baltimore, Maryland, United States
[7] Cisco Artificial Intelligence Systems, Cisco Inc., San Jose, California, United States
[8] Touro College of Medicine, New York, New York, United States
[9] School of Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom
[10] Quad City Gastroenterology, Davenport, Iowa, United States
[11] UnityPoint Health – Trinity Bettendorf, Bettendorf, Iowa, United States
[12] Department of Computer Science, University of Nevada Reno, Reno, Nevada, United States
* Correspondence: Nasif Zaman, MS, PhD, Department of Computer Science, University of Nevada Reno, Reno, Nevada, United States; William N. Pennington Engineering Building, 1664 N. Virginia Street, Reno, NV 89557, United States; Email: zaman@nevada.unr.edu, ORCid: 0000-0003-0120-0939

Abstract: Chronic low back pain (CLBP), frequently emanating from dynamic instability within the lumbar spine, constitutes a substantial global health challenge. While lumbosacral fusion remains a common surgical intervention for addressing this pathology, its inherent drawbacks, notably the acceleration of adjacent segment disease (ASD) at cephalad and caudal levels, the iatrogenic restriction of physiological intervertebral motion, and the potential for multifidus and erector spinae muscle atrophy, underscore the critical need for motion-preserving strategies. Here, we comprehensively review translational engineering advancements, particularly through mechanically tunable spinal implants and integrated intelligent sensor systems. We also thoroughly examine bioadaptive polymers and hybrid constructs that are being used in dynamic interspinous and interlaminar spacers, analyzing their time-dependent viscoelastic behavior and biomechanical compatibility through finite element modeling (FEM). Furthermore, we will explore the application of soft robotic principles to achieve personalized force modulation within innovative implant designs intended to dynamically stabilize the posterior elements, as well how microelectromechanical systems (MEMS) and nanosensors can help physicians with in-vivo monitoring of critical biomechanical parameters, including pedicle screw strain, intradiscal pressure within the nucleus pulposus and annulus fibrosus, and three-dimensional spinal kinematics across the instrumented segments. By doing so, our aim is to help clinicians and researchers alike seamlessly these integrate engineering solutions into everyday patient care.

Keywords: dynamic spine stabilization; spinal implants; motion-preserving devices; low back pain treatment; smart sensors; flexible spine implants; spinal biomechanics; adaptive spine support; load-sensing devices;

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.1626.v1

1. Clinical Foundation and Engineering Motivation

Chronic low back pain (CLBP) is very common among adult and geriatric patients, with dynamic spinal instability being the main biomechanical etiology of CLBP; this often results in nociceptive input, neuroforaminal stenosis with possible radiculopathy, and functional impairment [1]. This instability can arise from a cascade of degenerative processes affecting the structural integrity of the spinal column, including progressive degeneration of the intervertebral discs with resultant loss of disc height and altered load-bearing capacity, facet joint arthropathy characterized by cartilage degradation and osteophyte formation, and ligamentous laxity affecting the anterior longitudinal ligament, posterior longitudinal ligament, ligamentum flavum, interspinous ligament, and supraspinous ligament, thereby disrupting the intricate equilibrium of lumbar spine kinematics and load distribution across the vertebral bodies, intervertebral discs, and posterior elements [2–4].

The current gold standard is spinal arthrodesis, which eliminates motion at the symptomatic vertebral segment(s) by inducing a solid osseous fusion between adjacent vertebral bodies through pedicle screw fixation and interbody grafting [5]. Although lumbosacral fusion is linked with several well-documented drawbacks that can affect long-term patient outcomes, it can efficiently provide pain relief and improve stability in carefully chosen patient cohorts with clearly demonstrated instability [6,7]. These comprise the acceleration of degenerative changes at adjacent spinal levels (adjacent segment disease, ASD), a biomechanical consequence of changed load transfer and increased stress concentration at the mobile segments adjacent to the rigid fusion construct, a permanent restriction of physiological spinal motion in the sagittal, coronal, and axial planes, possibly compromising functional capacity and activities of daily life, and the potential for paraspinal muscle atrophy, particularly of the stabilizing multifidus muscle, resulting from altered segmental kinematics and compensatory muscular activity patterns in response to the fused segment [8–10].

2. Mechanically Tunable Spinal Implants

A main challenge for surgeons when placing spinal implants is that the implant must closely emulate the natural, time-dependent viscoelastic behavior of the intervertebral discs and spinal ligaments while concurrently providing sufficient structural integrity to restore and maintain spinal stability [11]. Mechanically tuned implants are particularly beneficial in this sense because they can modify their key mechanical properties, such stiffness, damping characteristics, or geometric configuration, in direct response to dynamically changing applied loads or evolving physiological variations within the lumbar spine [12,13]. This natural adaptability promises to provide tailored and responsive stabilization, thus reducing the restrictions related with stationary, non-adaptive implants [14].

2.1. Polymeric and Hybrid Materials in Tunable Spacers

Polymeric materials, particularly polyurethane elastomers with their inherent biocompatibility and tailorable mechanical properties, have significant potential as dynamic interspinous and interlaminar spacers that provide posterior element support without rigidly fusing the spinous processes or laminae [15,16]. These advanced polymeric formulations can be engineered with a wide spectrum of stiffness and damping coefficients and can serve as spacers that effectively absorbing and dissipating energy during physiological spinal motion, thereby potentially reducing stress concentrations on adjacent vertebral levels and posterior ligamentous structures [17]. Shape-memory alloys (SMAs) can also withstand reversible martensitic-austenitic phase transformations in direct response to specific thermal or mechanical stimuli [18]. A main example is the well-characterized nickel-titanium (NiTi) alloy [19]. For patients, this translates to spinal implants that can be deployed through minimally invasive surgical techniques in a smaller, less rigid configuration and subsequently expand or alter their geometric configuration in situ to provide optimal structural support [20,21].

Many groups are also investing in hybrid materials. For instance, composite hydrogels, which strategically combine the high-water content, inherent biocompatibility, and excellent tissue integration properties of hydrogels with the significantly enhanced mechanical strength and precisely tunable characteristics provided by reinforcing fibers (such as carbon nanotubes or biocompatible polymers) or nanoparticles (such as hydroxyapatite or bioactive ceramics), are very promising [22–24]. These constructs behave in an anisotropic viscoelastic manner, closely mimicking the complex, direction-dependent mechanical response of the intervertebral disc annulus fibrosus [25]. Furthermore, surgeons can facilitate tissue integration with the surrounding vertebral bone and ensure robust long-term implant stability if they integrate bioactive agents like bone morphogenetic proteins (BMPs) or osteoconductive materials [26,27].

2.2. Viscoelastic Properties and Biomechanical Compatibility

Achieving biomechanical compatibility from implant materials requires matching their viscoelastic characteristics to the dynamic environment of the lumbar spine [28]. Under physiological load, these characteristics—defined by a balance between energy dissipation (viscous behaviour) and energy storage (elastic behaviour) define how an implant responds to the multi-planar motion of the spine and manages mechanical energy [29]. Important new perspectives on the stiffness and damping performance of a material over different load frequencies come from metrics like dynamic modulus and loss tangent [30]. Aligning these properties with those of natural spinal tissues helps avoid stress shielding, a disorder whereby too stiff implants absorb too much load [31]. Reduced bone stimulation brought on by this mismatch can cause osteopenia, implant loosening, and long-term failure [32,33].

Simulating the biomechanical performance of tuned spacers now depends critically on finite element analysis (FEA) [34]. Research on sagittal alignment, segmental range of motion (ROM) in all planes, and foraminal dimensions—criteria vital to nerve root decompression and motion preservation—show that both implant stiffness and placement greatly affect these factors [35,36]. Engineers can maximise designs to support physiological lumbar lordosis, preserve controlled mobility, and strengthen the posterior column by varying parameters including Young's modulus, Poisson's ratio, and implant geometry in computational models [37]. FEA also helps refine treatments that lower the risk of adjacent segment degeneration by allowing prediction of stress transfer to nearby vertebrae and facet joints [38,39]. This modelling system supports a data-driven method of implant optimisation by anchoring design in measurable biomechanical outcomes [40].

2.3. Soft Robotic Concepts for Personalized Tension Modulation

Soft robotics, an innovative and rapidly growing field of research and development focused on the design, fabrication, and control of robots composed primarily of compliant and deformable materials, offers highly innovative strategies for achieving personalized and dynamically adjustable tension modulation in spinal stabilization implants [41,42]. For example, hydraulically driven interbody fusion cages could incorporate integrated fluid-filled chambers whose internal pressure can be actively and precisely regulated in real-time to dynamically adjust the stiffness and the degree of lordotic angle (the anterior tilt) of the implanted cage in direct response to varying levels of physical activity [43]. Magnetorheological (MR) fluids, which can rapidly and reversibly change their viscosity in direct response to an external magnetic field, are another promising option to adjust implants in real time [44]. For example, surgeons could add in interspinous process spacers with MR elastomers, then modulate its stiffness in real-time based on continuous feedback from integrated sensors, providing enhanced spinal stability during high-load activities that demand greater rigidity and greater flexibility during low-demand tasks that require a wider range of motion [45,46].

2.4. Clinical Findings and Future Material Directions

Existing dynamic stabilization devices currently available for clinical use, such as various interspinous process spacers and pedicle screw-based dynamic stabilization systems that incorporate flexible elements, have demonstrated promising clinical outcomes in carefully selected patient populations by providing effective pain relief and preserving a certain degree of physiological spinal motion compared to rigid fusion [47–49]. However, these earlier-generation devices are often not sophisticated enough to adapt to patient-specific movements [50]. Furthermore, many researchers are concerned about their long-term clinical effectiveness, device-related complications such as implant subsidence or migration, and their ability to truly prevent or significantly mitigate the development of ASD [51,52].

Companies that are actively capitalizing on sophisticated bioadaptive materials and intelligently integrated soft robotic principles seem to be overcoming the limitations of current static stabilization methods [53]. For instance, Invibio introduced the PEEK-OPTIMA implantable PEEK polymer in 1999, and are actively focused on refining polyurethane elastomers by incorporating reinforcing agents like carbon nanotubes or ceramic nanoparticles [54,55]. Researchers can then leverage these elastomers to create interspinous spacers with viscoelastic properties that can be precisely tuned to mimic the natural damping characteristics of the supraspinous and interspinous ligaments [56]. Furthermore, the integration of micro-actuation mechanisms is gaining traction. For example, concepts involving miniaturized electroactive polymer (EAP) actuators embedded within interlaminar stabilization devices are being explored in academic labs and early-stage companies [57,58]. These EAPs change shape or stiffness in response to an applied electric field and could similarly be used as MR fluids for real-time adjustments [59]. While not yet in widespread clinical use by major players like Medtronic or DePuy Synthes in a fully tunable dynamic stabilization device, their current dynamic stabilization offerings like the DYNESYS system (utilizing flexible cords and spacers) represent a foundational step towards incorporating more advanced actuation [60,61].

Many groups are also applying soft robotic principles into their implant designs. Prototypes of hydraulically or pneumatically actuated interbody fusion cages, conceptually similar to those being explored in research settings, could allow for controlled, post-operative adjustments to cage height and lordotic angle [62]. While not a primary focus of Stryker's current publicly available dynamic stabilization portfolio (which, following the sale of their spinal implants business to VB Spine, is in transition, though they retain interest in enabling technologies like Mako Spine that could play a role in precise placement of future dynamic devices), the underlying principle of adjustable interbody support remains a key area of interest in the broader spinal implant community [63,64]. Magnetorheological elastomers (MREs), whose stiffness can be controlled by an external magnetic field, are also under investigation for dynamic interspinous or facet joint replacement components, offering the potential for non-contact, real-time stiffness modulation [65]. The focus of future research must therefore be on the creation of materials demonstrating unequivocally superior fatigue resistance under complex, multi-axial spinal loading, enhanced long-term biocompatibility evidenced by minimal adverse tissue reactions and robust osseointegration facilitated by surface modifications like porous titanium coatings or bioactive ceramic deposition, and the development of reliable and precisely controllable micro-actuation systems capable of sustained mechanical tunability over the anticipated lifespan of the implant [66–68].

3. Smart Sensor Systems and Real-Time Load Feedback

The intelligent integration of smart sensor systems directly into spinal implants provides an unprecedented capability to continuously monitor critical biomechanical parameters in vivo, yielding invaluable real-time insights into implant performance, the biological response of the surrounding tissues, and the potential progression of underlying spinal pathologies [69]. This continuous stream of objective, real-time data has the significant potential to guide personalized post-operative rehabilitation protocols, provide tailored activity recommendations to patients, and even enable sophisticated closed-loop control of mechanically tunable implants, leading to more optimized and adaptive spinal stabilization [70,71].

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 20 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.1626.v1

3.1. Design and Integration of MEMS and Nanosensors

Microelectromechanical systems (MEMS) and their nanoscale counterparts, nanosensors, are another significant implant [72]. These highly miniaturized electromechanical devices, fabricated with micron and nanometer precision, respectively, can quantitatively measure physical parameters that can aid in patient-health risk [73]. For instance, strain gauges, well-established sensing elements grounded in piezoresistive or capacitive transduction principles, are being adapted to be added into pedicle screws and interbody fusion cages [74]. Companies like MicroStrain (now part of HBK), who specialize in miniature sensing solutions, offer strain gauges with dimensions suitable for embedding within these orthopedic hardware components [75]. These embedded sensors can then provide continuous, real-time measurements of the mechanical strain that the implant experiences physiological loading [76]. This in turn allows clinicians to map stress distribution and perform prospective risk-assessment for patients with weight and body compositions [77].

Furthermore, capacitive and piezoelectric pressure sensors are being actively engineered to integrate within interbody fusion cages and in proximity to facet joints [78]. Companies like Tekscan, who are known for their thin-film pressure sensing technology, are developing miniaturized pressure sensors that can quantify the intradiscal pressure within the nucleus pulposus and the annulus fibrosus [79]. Similarly, these sensors can be strategically positioned near the articulating surfaces of the facet joints to measure the contact forces generated during motion [80]. This granular, real-time pressure data is critical for understanding how different structures in the intervertebral segment load-share weight [81]. As advanced sensor designs often incorporate multi-element arrays, this means clinicians can see spatial resolution of the pressure distribution across the implant-tissue interface [82].

Miniaturized inertial measurement units (IMUs) that gyroscopes and accelerometers use are also being actively explored for direct integration into implants [83]. Bosch Sensortec, a leader in MEMS-based IMUs, offers compact, low-power devices capable of precisely measuring angular velocity and linear acceleration in three orthogonal axes [84]. When embedded within a spinal implant, these IMUs can output high-fidelity data on the intersegmental kinematics, detecting subtle yet clinically significant aberrant motions, such as excessive translational or rotational instability, or pathological coupled motions that may serve as early indicators of persistent spinal instability or potential implant loosening [85,86]. Sophisticated sensor fusion algorithms can then be applied to the raw data from these IMUs to reconstruct the three-dimensional motion of the instrumented spinal segment with high temporal resolution [87].

3.2. Conductive Polymers and Nanocomposite Sensors

Conductive polymers (CPs) and advanced nanocomposite materials can also be beneficial when added to implants [88]. Notably, CPs exhibit measurable changes in their electrical resistance in direct and predictable response to applied mechanical strain or pressure [89]. This makes them well-suited as flexible and intrinsically biocompatible strain and pressure sensors [90]. Researchers are actively exploring various CPs, such as polypyrrole (PPy), polyaniline (PANI), and poly(3,4-ethylenedioxythiophene) polystyrene sulfonate (PEDOT:PSS), focusing on enhancing their mechanical robustness, long-term stability in vivo, and sensitivity through chemical modification and controlled polymerization techniques [91,92]. Furthermore, advanced nanocomposite sensors, engineered by strategically incorporating conductive nanofillers (such as high-aspect-ratio carbon nanotubes (CNTs), single-layer graphene sheets, or metallic nanoparticles with tailored surface functionalization) within a biocompatible polymer matrix, can demonstrate significantly enhanced sensitivity and precisely tunable electrical characteristics compared to conventional sensing materials [93,94].

If surgeons incorporate these nanoscale conductive elements, it can dramatically amplify the piezoresistive or capacitive response of the composite material to applied mechanical stimuli [95]. For instance, adding aligned CNTs within a flexible polyurethane matrix can create highly sensitive strain sensors [96]. These materials can potentially be directly integrated as functional components within the load-bearing structure of spinal implants itself, therein effectively transforming the implant itself into an intrinsic sensor, or fabricated as ultrathin, flexible films that can be conformably adhered to the surfaces of existing implant designs, thus providing localized, high-resolution biomechanical feedback without significantly altering the implant's overall mechanical profile or footprint [97,98]. Ongoing research is focused on optimizing the dispersion and alignment of the nanofillers within the polymer matrix to maximize sensor performance, enhance biocompatibility, and ensure long-term stability within the demanding in vivo environment [99].

3.3. Wireless Telemetry and Energy Harvesting

Wireless telemetry systems that connect to implants can help clinicians easily acquire patient-specific biomechanical data, which can then be used for real-time feedback control of actively tunable implants [100]. A diverse array of low-power wireless communication protocols, including the widely adopted Bluetooth Low Energy (BLE) standard and the short-range, low-power Near-Field Communication (NFC) technology, are currently used in many wearable and otherwise mobile devices [101]. These protocols offer the key advantages of minimal power consumption, which is crucial for extending the operational lifespan of the implanted device, and secure data transmission capabilities to ensure the privacy and integrity of the sensitive biomechanical information being relayed to external monitoring and control units [102]. To address the inherent limitations of implanted batteries, which possess a finite energy storage capacity and introduce a potential risk of device malfunction upon depletion, significant and sustained research efforts are being directed towards the development and seamless integration of efficient energy harvesting technologies capable of scavenging energy from the physiological environment [103]. Piezoelectric energy harvesters, which convert mechanical strain and vibration into usable electrical energy through the piezoelectric effect, are being explored for their potential to regenerate lost bone [104]. Similarly, inductive coupling systems, which wirelessly transfer electrical power from an external transmitting coil positioned near the skin surface to a receiving coil integrated within the implant, are being investigated as a means of providing continuous or intermittent power to the embedded sensors and telemetry electronics without requiring percutaneous wires or implanted batteries [105]. The efficiency and miniaturization of these energy harvesting technologies are critical areas of ongoing development to ensure they can provide sufficient power to operate the sensing and communication functionalities of smart spinal implants over extended periods without generating excessive heat or causing adverse effects on surrounding tissues [106].

4. Control Algorithms and Biomechanical Intelligence

Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) techniques are increasingly being employed to analyze complex sensor data streams, identify subtle patterns indicative of instability or changing biomechanical demands, and predict potential adverse biomechanical events, thereby enabling proactive and intelligent control of implant function [107].

4.1. AI/ML-Based Control Systems

As AI/ML technologies continue to develop, many clinically-relevant tools are moving beyond theoretical concepts, with specific technologies and collaborations between medical groups and private companies emerging [108]. For instance, Google Health AI is actively developing advanced analytics and predictive modeling tools for healthcare, and while not yet a direct component in a dynamic spinal implant, their expertise in processing large datasets and developing predictive models for various medical conditions could be leveraged for future implant control algorithms [109]. Furthermore, NVIDIA's Clara Holoscan, a real-time AI inference and visualization platform for medical devices, provides the infrastructure for processing sensor data with low latency [110]. While currently focused on applications like endoscopy and microscopy, the underlying technology for high-speed data processing and AI inference at the edge could be adapted for future smart spinal implants [111]. Theoretically, implants equipped with high-bandwidth sensors can transmit data to an on-board NVIDIA Jetson module running Clara Holoscan [112]. This module could execute pre-trained AI models to identify patterns indicative of instability or high stress, triggering immediate adjustments in the implant's mechanical properties [113].

While fully autonomous AI-driven dynamic stabilization systems aren't yet commercially available, there are significant advancements in related areas [114]. For example, Medtronic's Mazor Robotic Guidance System utilizes AI-powered planning software to optimize screw placement in spinal fusion surgeries [115]. This demonstrates the company's investment in AI for spine procedures, and this expertise could potentially be extended to guide the parameters of future dynamic implants based on pre-operative planning and intraoperative data [116]. Similarly, Globus Medical's ExcelsiusGPS robotic navigation platform incorporates machine learning algorithms to enhance surgical accuracy [117]. While focused on fusion, the underlying AI capabilities for data analysis and real-time guidance are foundational for more complex dynamic systems [118].

4.2. Real-Time Decision-Making Algorithms

In addition to smart spinal implants, researchers must develop algorithms that can rapidly interpret sensor data [119]. Fortunately, many companies specializing in embedded systems and real-time control are actively contributing to this domain [120]. For example, Analog Devices produces high-performance analog and digital signal processing components that are essential for acquiring and processing sensor data with minimal delay [121]. Their microcontrollers and digital signal processors (DSPs) could help clinicians quickly interpret strain, pressure, and motion data to adjust actuator parameters [122]. A real-time algorithm running on an Analog Devices DSP could therefore continuously monitor the force exerted on the spacer via embedded force sensors [123]. If the force exceeds a pre-defined threshold during a sudden flexion movement, the algorithm could instantaneously command the piezoelectric actuators to increase the spacer's stiffness, providing enhanced support and limiting excessive motion [124]. Conversely, during periods of rest, the stiffness could be automatically reduced to allow for more natural spinal kinematics [125]. Siemens Healthineers' AI-Rad Companion can likewise help interpret patient scans and give physicians another layer of information, in addition to sensory data from implants [126]. Using these images, AI/ML algorithms could analyze changes in vertebral body alignment or disc height to guide long-term adjustments in an actively articulating interbody cage [127].

4.3. Edge AI and Neuromorphic Computing

Edge AI and neuromorphic computing can also help advance implantable [128]. While direct commercial products in dynamic spine surgery are not commercially available, the foundational technologies are being developed [129]. Intel's Loihi 2 neuromorphic research chip, for example, can be linked to data from multiple embedded sensors and execute sophisticated control algorithms with minimal power consumption, potentially powered wirelessly through inductive coupling [130]. This on-device AI could enable highly personalized and adaptive stabilization strategies without the need for constant external communication [131]. Similarly, BrainChip's Akida neuromorphic processor is another example of hardware designed for efficient edge AI inference [132]. Its event-based processing architecture is well-suited for analyzing the asynchronous data streams from neural or biomechanical sensors [133].

In terms of 3D printed implants and sensory integration, companies like Formlabs provide high-resolution 3D printers that can fit implants with intricate geometries and biocompatible materials [134]. Researchers are exploring the use of such printers to create custom spinal implants with integrated sensor channel housings [135]. Furthermore, advancements in conductive inks and materials allow for the direct printing of sensor elements onto or within 3D-printed implants [136]. While not a specific product for dynamic tunability with embedded AI, this trend towards customized, sensor-integrated implants created by additive manufacturing lays the groundwork for future generations of smart, adaptable spinal stabilization devices [137].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.1626.v1

5. Translational Roadmap and Regulatory Strategy

5.1. Preclinical Testing and Regulatory Compliance

Due to how interconnected spine surgery is, there is no wide-spread, rigorous, or legally sound translational roadmap that surgeons can currently use [138]. As such, we detail a roadmap that comprehensively addresses critical aspects such as exhaustive preclinical testing conducted in compliance with Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) regulations (21 CFR Part 58), the landscape of regulatory hurdles specific to active implantable medical devices as defined by 21 CFR Part 860 and relevant international standards (e.g., ISO 13485), stringent ethical considerations pertaining to data privacy under regulations like HIPAA (in the US) and GDPR (in Europe), and robust clinical validation conducted in accordance with Good Clinical Practice (GCP) guidelines (21 CFR Part 50, 54, and 56) and the Declaration of Helsinki [139–141].

Initially, comprehensive and multi-faceted in vitro biomechanical testing, conducted in compliance with relevant ASTM standards (e.g., ASTM F2077 for intervertebral body fusion devices), is essential to rigorously evaluate the fundamental mechanical performance, long-term fatigue resistance under simulated physiological loading conditions (as defined by ISO 12189 for dynamic stabilization devices), and the inherent biocompatibility of novel implant designs and the advanced materials from which they are fabricated, adhering to ISO 10993 standards for biological evaluation of medical devices [142,143]. Cyclic loading test are also important to assess long-term durability and potential for mechanical failure of the devices [144]. FEA and computational modeling should also be validated against empirical in vitro data and conducted using validated software under quality assurance processes (21 CFR Part 820) [145]. Furthermore, well-designed in vivo studies utilizing appropriate large animal models that closely mimic human lumbar spine biomechanics are absolutely necessary to thoroughly evaluate the implant's interaction with biological tissues, assess local and systemic biocompatibility according to ISO 10993, evaluate the degree and quality of osseointegration at the bone-implant interface using standardized radiological and histological techniques, and provide preliminary evidence of functional outcomes before proceeding to human clinical trials [146,147]. These rigorous preclinical studies must generate robust and compelling evidence of both the safety and the potential efficacy of the novel implantable devices before their evaluation in human subjects can be ethically and scientifically justified under 45 CFR Part 46 (Protection of Human Subjects) [148].

5.2. FDA Regulatory Pathways and Compliance

Adaptive spinal implants that incorporate active control mechanisms based on real-time sensor feedback and the ability to dynamically adjust their mechanical properties will likely be classified as either Class II (Special Controls) or, more likely, Class III (Premarket Approval) medical devices by stringent regulatory agencies such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), as defined under the Medical Device Amendments of 1976 and subsequent regulations (21 CFR Parts 860-892), depending on the level of risk associated with the device and its intended use [149]. In order to successfully navigate the complex regulatory pathway, researchers must thoroughly understand the specific requirements for these device classifications, including the comprehensive submission of extensive preclinical data demonstrating safety and performance in accordance with 21 CFR Part 820 (Quality System Regulation), detailed results of rigorous biocompatibility testing conducted according to ISO 10993 standards and documented under GLP, and meticulously detailed device specifications, including materials, design, manufacturing processes validated under 21 CFR Part 820, and comprehensive software validation documentation adhering to FDA guidance on software as a medical device [150,151]. For Class III devices, which are considered to pose a higher risk to the patient, premarket approval (PMA) under Section 515 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. § 360e) will almost certainly be required [152]. The PMA process involves rigorous scientific review of all preclinical and clinical data to provide reasonable assurance of the device's safety and effectiveness for its intended use in the target patient population, as determined through well-controlled clinical investigations conducted under an Investigational Device Exemption (IDE, 21 CFR Part 812) [153]. The proactive development of clear and specific regulatory guidelines specifically tailored to the unique characteristics of smart spinal implants will be absolutely crucial for facilitating their efficient and safe clinical translation, providing a clear pathway for innovation while ensuring patient safety and compliance with all applicable FDA regulations and guidance documents [154].

5.3. Translational Pipeline, Clinical Integration, and Reimbursement Pathways

A well-defined and strategically planned translational pipeline should encompass an iterative process of implant design optimization based on continuous feedback from sophisticated computational modeling and rigorous preclinical testing conducted under GLP [155]. This should be followed by carefully designed and ethically approved pilot clinical studies conducted at experienced centers under IDE approval and GCP guidelines to rigorously evaluate the initial safety and preliminary efficacy of the novel smart implants in human subjects with the target spinal pathology, ensuring adherence to 21 CFR Part 812 [156]. Seamless integration into existing national and international spine registries, such as the North American Spine Society Quality Outcomes Database (NASS-QOD) in the US or the EUROSPINE Spine Tango registry in Europe, can significantly facilitate the systematic collection of valuable long-term outcome data, including PROs, adverse events, and implant survival rates, and enable meaningful comparisons of the new technologies with established surgical and non-surgical treatments for spinal instability [157,158]. The meticulous development and submission of Investigational Device Exemption (IDE) applications to relevant regulatory agencies (e.g., the FDA in the US or EMA in Europe) will be a critical step in formally initiating human clinical trials and gathering the necessary clinical evidence to support eventual regulatory approval (PMA or equivalent) and widespread clinical adoption of these innovative engineering solutions [159]. Furthermore, consideration of reimbursement pathways, including coding (e.g., CPT codes in the US), coverage policies by payers (e.g., CMS in the US), and health economic evaluations demonstrating the value proposition of these advanced technologies, will be crucial for ensuring patient access and the long-term sustainability of these treatments [160,161].

6. Future Directions

Smart spinal implants of the future will probably incorporate synergistic integration with exoskeletal systems and wearable rehabilitation devices [162]. Dynamic personalising of post-operative rehabilitation protocols will be enabled by real-time biomechanical telemetry from embedded sensors capturing granular data on intersegmental kinematics, implant loads, and paraspinal muscle activity [163]. Beyond the confines of static implants, this data-driven feedback can adjust the assistive torques and degrees of freedom given by exoskeletons, so optimising gait retraining, proprioceptive re-education, and minimizing aberrant spinal micro-motion to prevent re-injury and improve long-term functional recovery [164,165].

Although most studies now focus on degenerative spinal instability in adults, the ideas of smart sensors and adjustable implants have promise for use in children and in cancer treatment [166]. Correcting congenital defects such as scoliosis or post-tumor resection instability calls for customized implant designs that fit pediatric growth dynamics and complex biomechanical changes [167]. Moreover, the creation of strong artificial intelligence/machine learning control systems for these uses calls for large, high-quality datasets including pediatric-specific biomechanics and the special loading conditions in tumor-related instability [168]. Training and validation of these advanced predictive models for personalized and efficient dynamic stabilization in these demanding patient populations depend on standardized data acquisition methods and safe data-sharing programs [169,170].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.1626.v1

Conclusion

The field of translational engineering is poised to revolutionize the management of dynamic lumbar spine instability through the advent of mechanically tunable implants and integrated smart sensor systems. These innovative technologies offer the potential for personalized and dynamically responsive spinal support, preserving near-physiological intervertebral kinematics by adapting their mechanical properties in response to the spine's complex viscoelastic behavior and changing physiological demands. Real-time monitoring of critical in vivo biomechanical parameters via embedded sensors will enable sophisticated closed-loop control algorithms, allowing for dynamic adjustments of implant stiffness, damping, and tension to optimize spinal stabilization.

Despite the significant promise, successful clinical translation necessitates overcoming substantial challenges in advanced material science, robust sensor integration, and the development of reliable AI/ML-driven control systems. Rigorous preclinical testing, meticulous navigation of complex regulatory pathways (e.g., FDA PMA), and careful consideration of ethical and privacy implications associated with continuous biomechanical data acquisition are paramount. Future research should prioritize the synergistic integration of smart spinal implants with wearable rehabilitation devices and exoskeletal systems, leveraging real-time biomechanical telemetry to personalize recovery and augment functional outcomes. Furthermore, exploring applications in pediatric and tumor-related spinal instability will require tailored implant designs and control strategies informed by robust, high-quality datasets for algorithm training and validation, ultimately aiming to transform the surgical treatment of CLBP and enhance patient quality of life.

Statements and Declarations:

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Patents: Not applicable

Competing Interests: The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Acknowledgements: None.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Clinical Trial Number: Not applicable.

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Contribution Conceptualization: R.K., K.S., P.P., A.K., C.G., A.N., A.A.; Methodology: R.K., K.S., P.P., A.K., C.G., L.C.; Formal analysis: R.K., K.S., C.G., A.K.; Writing – Original Draft: R.K., K.S., P.P., A.K., C.G., A.N., A.A.; Writing – Review & Editing: R.J., J.O., N.Z., R.L., T.K.; Supervision: R.J., J.O., N.Z., A.T.; Project administration: R.K., R.J.

Acknowledgements: We thank Ms. Tammie Xie for providing us with an APC waiver, therein allowing our research group to publish this comprehensive review paper

References

1. Sengupta, D.K. Dynamic Stabilization Devices in the Treatment of Low Back Pain. *Orthop. Clin. North Am.* 2004, 35, 43–56. doi:10.1016/S0030-5898(03)00087-7. PMID:15062717.
2. Rohlmann, A.; Burra, N.K.; Zander, T.; Bergmann, G. Comparison of the Effects of Bilateral Posterior Dynamic and Rigid Fixation Devices on the Loads in the Lumbar Spine: A Finite Element Analysis. *Eur. Spine J.* 2007, 16, 1223–1231. doi:10.1007/s00586-006-0292-8. PMID:17206401.

3. Wilke, H.J.; Drumm, J.; Häussler, K.; Mack, C.; Steudel, W.I.; Kettler, A. Biomechanical Effect of Different Lumbar Interspinous Implants on Flexibility and Intradiscal Pressure. *Eur. Spine J.* 2008, 17, 1049–1056. doi:10.1007/s00586-008-0657-2. PMID:18584219.
4. Bellini, C.M.; Galbusera, F.; Raimondi, M.T.; Mineo, G.V.; Brayda-Bruno, M. Biomechanics of the Lumbar Spine After Dynamic Stabilization. *J. Spinal Disord. Tech.* 2007, 20, 423–429. doi:10.1097/BSD.0b013e318030c9e3. PMID:17970183.
5. Kanayama, M.; Cunningham, B.W.; Haggerty, C.J.; Abumi, K.; Kaneda, K.; McAfee, P.C. In Vitro Biomechanical Investigation of the Stability and Stress-Shielding Effect of Lumbar Interbody Fusion Devices. *J. Neurosurg.* 2000, 93, 259–265. doi:10.3171/spi.2000.93.2.0259. PMID:11012056.
6. Buric, J.; Pulidori, M. Long-Term Reduction in Pain and Disability After Surgery with the Interspinous Device for Intervertebral Assisted Motion (DIAM) Spinal Stabilization System in Patients with Low Back Pain: 4-Year Follow-Up from a Longitudinal Prospective Case Series. *Eur. Spine J.* 2011, 20, 1304–1311. doi:10.1007/s00586-011-1697-6. PMID:21279392.
7. Chen, C.S.; Huang, C.H.; Shih, S.L. Biomechanical Evaluation of a New Pedicle Screw-Based Posterior Dynamic Stabilization Device (Awesome Rod System)—A Finite Element Analysis. *BMC Musculoskelet. Disord.* 2015, 16, 81. doi:10.1186/s12891-015-0538-x. PMID:25880231.
8. Viswanathan, V.K.; Ganguly, R.; Minnema, A.J.; DeVries Watson, N.A.; Grosland, N.M.; Fredericks, D.C.; Grossbach, A.J.; Viljoen, S.V.; Farhadi, H.F. Biomechanical Evaluation of a Dynamic Stabilization System for the Prevention of Proximal Junctional Failure in Adult Deformity Surgery. *J. Neurosurg. Spine* 2018, 30, 184–192. doi:10.3171/2018.7.SPINE18136. PMID:30497219.
9. Mageswaran, P.; Techy, F.; Colbrunn, R.W.; Bonner, T.F.; McLain, R.F. Hybrid Dynamic Stabilization: A Biomechanical Assessment of Adjacent and Supraadjacent Levels of the Lumbar Spine. *J. Neurosurg. Spine* 2012, 17, 232–242. doi:10.3171/2012.6.SPINE111054. PMID:22839756.
10. Schmoelz, W.; Huber, J.F.; Nydegger, T.; Claes, L.; Wilke, H.J. Dynamic Stabilization of the Lumbar Spine and Its Effects on Adjacent Segments: An In Vitro Experiment. *J. Spinal Disord. Tech.* 2003, 16, 418–423. doi:10.1097/00024720-200308000-00015. PMID:12902958.
11. Niosi, C.A.; Zhu, Q.A.; Wilson, D.C.; Keynan, O.; Wilson, D.R.; Oxland, T.R. Biomechanical Characterization of the Three-Dimensional Kinematic Behaviour of the Dynesys Dynamic Stabilization System: An In Vitro Study. *Eur. Spine J.* 2006, 15, 913–922. doi:10.1007/s00586-005-0948-9. PMID:16217663.
12. Yue, J.J.; Timm, J.P.; Panjabi, M.M.; Jaramillo-de la Torre, J. Clinical Application of the Panjabi Neutral Zone Hypothesis: The Stabilimax NZ Posterior Lumbar Dynamic Stabilization System. *Neurosurg. Focus* 2007, 22, E12. doi:10.3171/foc.2007.22.1.12. PMID:17608333.
13. Korovessis, P.; Papazisis, Z.; Koureas, G.; Lambiris, E. Rigid, Semirigid Versus Dynamic Instrumentation for Degenerative Lumbar Spinal Stenosis: A Correlative Radiological and Clinical Analysis of Short-Term Results. *Spine* 2004, 29, 735–742. doi:10.1097/01.brs.0000112072.83196.0f. PMID:15087795.
14. Shih, S.L.; Chen, C.S.; Lin, H.M.; Huang, L.Y.; Liu, C.L.; Huang, C.H.; Cheng, C.K. Effect of Spacer Diameter of the Dynesys Dynamic Stabilization System on the Biomechanics of the Lumbar Spine: A Finite Element Analysis. *J. Spinal Disord. Tech.* 2012, 25, E140–E149. doi:10.1097/BSD.0b013e31824e5e10. PMID:22744611.
15. Li, C.Y.; Chen, M.Y.; Chang, C.N.; Yan, J.L. Three-Dimensional Volumetric Changes and Clinical Outcomes After Decompression with DIAM™ Implantation in Patients with Degenerative Lumbar Spine Diseases. *Medicina* 2020, 56, 723. doi:10.3390/medicina56120723. PMID:33371350.
16. Hartmann, F.; Dietz, S.O.; Kuhn, S.; Hely, H.; Rommens, P.M.; Gercek, E. Biomechanical Comparison of an Interspinous Device and a Rigid Stabilization on Lumbar Adjacent Segment Range of Motion. *Acta Chir. Orthop. Traumatol. Cech.* 2011, 78, 404–409. PMID:22094153.
17. Kulduk, A.; Altun, N.S.; Senkoylu, A. Biomechanical Comparison of Effects of the Dynesys and Coflex Dynamic Stabilization Systems on Range of Motion and Loading Characteristics in the Lumbar Spine: A Finite Element Study. *Int. J. Med. Robot.* 2015, 11, 400–405. doi:10.1002/rcs.1636. PMID:25643936.
18. Fan, W.; Guo, L.X. Biomechanical Investigation of Topping-Off Technique Using an Interspinous Process Device Following Lumbar Interbody Fusion Under Vibration Loading. *Med. Biol. Eng. Comput.* 2021, 59, 2449–2458. doi:10.1007/s11517-021-02458-z. PMID:34671891.

doi:10.20944/preprints202505.1626.v1

19. Lee, C.H.; Kim, Y.E.; Lee, H.J.; Kim, D.G.; Kim, C.H. Biomechanical Effects of Hybrid Stabilization on the Risk of Proximal Adjacent-Segment Degeneration Following Lumbar Spinal Fusion Using an Interspinous Device or a Pedicle Screw-Based Dynamic Fixator. *J. Neurosurg. Spine* 2017, 27, 643–649. doi:10.3171/2017.3.SPINE161169. PMID:28937328.
20. Wong, C.E.; Hu, H.T.; Kao, L.H.; Liu, C.J.; Chen, K.C.; Huang, K.Y. Biomechanical Feasibility of Semi-Rigid Stabilization and Semi-Rigid Lumbar Interbody Fusion: A Finite Element Study. *BMC Musculoskelet. Disord.* 2022, 23, 10. doi:10.1186/s12891-021-04958-3. PMID:34980068.
21. Tyagi, V.; Strom, R.; Tanweer, O.; Frempong-Boadu, A.K. Posterior Dynamic Stabilization of the Lumbar Spine: Review of Biomechanical and Clinical Studies. *Bull. Hosp. Jt. Dis.* 2018, 76, 100–104. PMID:29799368.
22. Gornet, M.F.; Chan, F.W.; Coleman, J.C.; Murrell, B.; Nockels, R.P.; Taylor, B.A.; Lanman, T.H.; Ochoa, J.A. Biomechanical Assessment of a PEEK Rod System for Semi-Rigid Fixation of Lumbar Fusion Constructs. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 2011, 133, 081009. doi:10.1115/1.4004862. PMID:21950902.
23. Ha, K.Y.; Hwang, S.C.; Whang, T.H. Biomechanical Stability According to Different Configurations of Screws and Rods. *J. Spinal Disord. Tech.* 2013, 26, 155–160. doi:10.1097/BSD.0b013e31823ba058. PMID:22105105.
24. Facchinello, Y.; Brailovski, V.; Petit, Y.; Brummund, M.; Tremblay, J.; Mac-Thiong, J.M. Biomechanical Assessment of the Stabilization Capacity of Monolithic Spinal Rods with Different Flexural Stiffness and Anchoring Arrangement. *Spine* 2015, 40, E1169–E1176. doi:10.1097/BRS.0000000000001115. PMID:26356072.
25. Cao, L.; Liu, Y.; Mei, W.; Xu, J.; Zhan, S. Biomechanical Changes of Degenerated Adjacent Segment and Intact Lumbar Spine After Lumbosacral Topping-Off Surgery: A Three-Dimensional Finite Element Analysis. *BMC Musculoskelet. Disord.* 2020, 21, 104. doi:10.1186/s12891-020-3128-5. PMID:32061252.
26. Hsiao, C.K.; Tsai, Y.J.; Yen, C.Y.; Li, Y.C.; Hsiao, H.Y.; Tu, Y.K. Biomechanical Effect of Hybrid Dynamic Stabilization Implant on the Segmental Motion and Intradiscal Pressure in Human Lumbar Spine. *Bioengineering* 2022, 10, 31. doi:10.3390/bioengineering10010031. PMID:36671603.
27. Lin, H.M.; Liu, C.L.; Pan, Y.N.; Huang, C.H.; Shih, S.L.; Wei, S.H.; Chen, C.S. Biomechanical Analysis and Design of a Dynamic Spinal Fixator Using Topology Optimization: A Finite Element Analysis. *Med. Biol. Eng. Comput.* 2014, 52, 499–508. doi:10.1007/s11517-014-1154-x. PMID:24710853.
28. Fiani, B.; Noblett, C.; Chacon, D.; Siddiqi, I.; Pennington, E.; Kortz, M. Total Posterior Spinal Arthroplasty Systems for Dynamic Stability. *Cureus* 2020, 12, e12361. doi:10.7759/cureus.12361. PMID:33520555.
29. Sangiorgio, S.N.; Sheikh, H.; Borkowski, S.L.; Khoo, L.; Warren, C.R.; Ebramzadeh, E. Comparison of Three Posterior Dynamic Stabilization Devices. *Spine* 2011, 36, E1251–E1258. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e31820e6415. PMID:21343855.
30. Bae, I.S.; Bak, K.H.; Chun, H.J.; Ryu, J.I.; Park, S.J.; Lee, S.J. Biomechanical Analysis of a Newly Developed Interspinous Process Device Conjunction with Interbody Cage Based on a Finite Element Model. *PLoS One* 2020, 15, e0243771. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0243771. PMID:33306706.
31. Kashkoush, A.; Agarwal, N.; Paschel, E.; Goldschmidt, E.; Gerszten, P.C. Evaluation of a Hybrid Dynamic Stabilization and Fusion System in the Lumbar Spine: A 10 Year Experience. *Cureus* 2016, 8, e637. doi:10.7759/cureus.637. PMID:27433416.
32. Acosta, F.L.; Christensen, F.B.; Coe, J.D.; Jahng, T.A.; Kitchel, S.H.; Meisel, H.J.; Schnöring, M.; Wingo, C.H.; Ames, C.P. Early Clinical & Radiographic Results of NFix II Posterior Dynamic Stabilization System. *Spine J.* 2012, 12, S141–S142. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2012.08.374. PMID:22939207.
33. Wu, J.; Miao, J.; Chen, G.; Xu, H.; Wen, W.; Xu, H.; Liu, L. Finite Element Biomechanical Analysis of 3D Printed Intervertebral Fusion Cage in Osteoporotic Population. *BMC Musculoskelet. Disord.* 2024, 25, 129. doi:10.1186/s12891-024-07221-7. PMID:38347518.
34. Xu, Z.; Zheng, Q.; Zhang, L.; Chen, R.; Li, Z.; Xu, W. Biomechanical Evaluation of Different Oblique Lumbar Interbody Fusion Constructs: A Finite Element Analysis. *BMC Musculoskelet. Disord.* 2024, 25, 97. doi:10.1186/s12891-024-07204-8. PMID:38273209.
35. Cannestra, A.F.; Peterson, M.D.; Parker, S.R.; Roush, T.F.; Bundy, J.V.; Turner, A.W. MIS Expandable Interbody Spacers: A Literature Review and Biomechanical Comparison of an Expandable MIS TLIF with Conventional TLIF and ALIF. *Spine* 2016, 41, S44–S49. doi:10.1097/BRS.0000000000001465. PMID:26825792.

36. Pradeep, K.; Pal, B. Biomechanical and Clinical Studies on Lumbar Spine Fusion Surgery: A Review. *Med. Biol. Eng. Comput.* 2023, 61, 617–634. doi:10.1007/s11517-022-02750-6. PMID:36598676.
37. Cho, M.; Han, J.S.; Kang, S.; Ahn, C.H.; Kim, D.H.; Kim, C.H.; Kim, K.T.; Kim, A.R.; Hwang, J.M. Biomechanical Effects of Different Sitting Postures and Physiologic Movements on the Lumbar Spine: A Finite Element Study. *Bioengineering* 2023, 10, 1051. doi:10.3390/bioengineering10091051. PMID:37760153.
38. Meng, H.; Li, Q.; Lin, J.; Yang, Y.; Fei, Q. Intradiscal Cement Leakage (ICL) Increases the Stress on Adjacent Vertebrae After Kyphoplasty for Osteoporotic Vertebra Compression Fracture (OVCF): A Finite-Element Study. *Sci. Rep.* 2023, 13, 15984. doi:10.1038/s41598-023-43375-5. PMID:37749207.
39. Costăchescu, B.; Niculescu, A.G.; Grumezescu, A.M.; Teleanu, D.M. Screw Osteointegration—Increasing Biomechanical Resistance to Pull-Out Effect. *Materials* 2023, 16, 3462. doi:10.3390/ma16093462. PMID:37176349.
40. Liu, J.; Yang, S.; Zhou, F.; Lu, J.; Xia, C.; Wang, H.; Chen, C. The Feasibility of Short-Segment Schanz Screw Implanted in an Oblique Downward Direction for the Treatment of Lumbar 1 Burst Fracture: A Finite Element Analysis. *J. Orthop. Surg. Res.* 2020, 15, 537. doi:10.1186/s13018-020-02024-7. PMID:33203406.
41. Uri, O.; Folman, Y.; Laufer, G.; Behrbalk, E. A Novel Spine Fixation System Made Entirely of Carbon-Fiber-Reinforced PEEK Composite: An In Vitro Mechanical Evaluation. *Adv. Orthop.* 2020, 2020, 4796136. doi:10.1155/2020/4796136. PMID:32566313.
42. Oda, Y.; Takigawa, T.; Ito, Y.; Misawa, H.; Tetsunaga, T.; Uotani, K.; Ozaki, T. Mechanical Study of Various Pedicle Screw Systems Including Percutaneous Pedicle Screw in Trauma Treatment. *Medicina* 2022, 58, 565. doi:10.3390/medicina58050565. PMID:35629982.
43. Danison, A.P.; Lee, D.J.; Panchal, R.R. Temporary Stabilization of Unstable Spine Fractures. *Curr. Rev. Musculoskelet. Med.* 2017, 10, 199–206. doi:10.1007/s12178-017-9402-y. PMID:28316056.
44. Schlenk, R.P.; Stewart, T.; Benzel, E.C. The Biomechanics of Iatrogenic Spinal Destabilization and Implant Failure. *Neurosurg. Focus* 2003, 15, E2. doi:10.3171/foc.2003.15.3.2. PMID:15347220.
45. Li, C.; Zhao, Y.; Qi, L.; Xu, B.; Yue, L.; Zhu, R.; Li, C. Comparison of Biomechanical Effects of Polyetheretherketone (PEEK) Rods and Titanium Rods in Lumbar Long-Segment Instrumentation: A Finite Element Study. *Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol.* 2024, 12, 1416046. doi:10.3389/fbioe.2024.1416046. PMID:39055340.
46. Saghebdous, S.; Zare, R.; Chaurasia, B.; Vakilzadeh, M.M.; Yousefi, O.; Boustani, M.R. Dynamic Rod Constructs as the Preventive Strategy Against Adjacent Segment Disease in Degenerative Lumbar Spinal Disorders: A Retrospective Comparative Cohort Study. *Arch. Bone Jt. Surg.* 2023, 11, 404–413. doi:10.22038/ABJS.2022.68498.3239. PMID:37404298.
47. Fuster, S.; Martínez-Anda, J.J.; Castillo-Rivera, S.A.; Vargas-Reverón, C.; Tornero, E. Dynamic Fixation Techniques for the Prevention of Adjacent Segment Disease: A Retrospective Controlled Study. *Asian Spine J.* 2022, 16, 401–410. doi:10.31616/asj.2020.0585. PMID:34130381.
48. Porrino, J.; Rao, A.; Moran, J.; Wang, A.; Grauer, J.; Haims, A.; Kani, K. Current Concepts of Spondylosis and Posterior Spinal Motion Preservation for Radiologists. *Skeletal Radiol.* 2021, 50, 2169–2184. doi:10.1007/s00256-021-03840-6. PMID:34131792.
49. Kobbe, P.; Hildebrand, F.; Stoffel, M.; Markert, B.; Siewe, J. Biomechanical Testing of a Polycarbonate-Urethane-Based Dynamic Instrumentation System Under Physiological Conditions. *Clin. Biomech.* 2019, 61, 112–119. doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2018.11.013. PMID:30502696.
50. Oikonomidis, S.; Sobottke, R.; Wilke, H.J.; Herren, C.; Beckmann, A.; Zarghooni, K.; Siewe, J. Material Failure in Dynamic Spine Implants: Are the Standardized Implant Tests Before Market Launch Sufficient? *Eur. Spine J.* 2019, 28, 1351–1360. doi:10.1007/s00586-019-05946-y. PMID:30945003.
51. Beckmann, A.; Herren, C.; Mundt, M.; Siewe, J.; Kobbe, P.; Sobottke, R.; Pape, H.C.; Stoffel, M. A New In Vitro Spine Test Rig to Track Multiple Vertebral Motions Under Physiological Conditions. *Biomed. Eng.-Biomed. Tech.* 2017, 62, 583–592. doi:10.1515/bmt-2016-0182. PMID:28358716.
52. Zhou, L.P.; Zhang, R.J.; Wang, J.Q.; Zhang, H.Q.; Shang, J.; Gao, Y.; Jia, C.Y.; Ding, J.Y.; Zhang, L.; Shen, C.L. Medium and Long-Term Radiographic and Clinical Outcomes of Dynesys Dynamic Stabilization Versus Instrumented Fusion for Degenerative Lumbar Spine Diseases. *BMC Surg.* 2023, 23, 46. doi:10.1186/s12893-023-01943-6. PMID:36855117.

53. Zhao, Y.; Xu, B.; Qi, L.; Li, C.; Yue, L.; Yu, Z.; Wang, S.; Sun, H. Hybrid Surgery with PEEK Rods for Lumbar Degenerative Diseases: A 2-Year Follow-Up Study. *BMC Musculoskelet. Disord.* 2021, 22, 756. doi:10.1186/s12891-021-04629-3. PMID:34488703.
54. Mavrogenis, A.F.; Vottis, C.; Triantafyllopoulos, G.; Papagelopoulos, P.J.; Pneumaticos, S.G. PEEK Rod Systems for the Spine. *Eur. J. Orthop. Surg. Traumatol.* 2014, 24, S111–S116. doi:10.1007/s00590-014-1421-4. PMID:24487665.
55. Chung, S.K.; Kim, Y.E.; Wang, K.C. Biomechanical Effect of Constraint in Lumbar Total Disc Replacement: A Study with Finite Element Analysis. *Spine* 2009, 34, 1281–1286. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e3181a4ec2d. PMID:19455003.
56. Kim, H.; Lim, D.H.; Oh, H.J.; Lee, K.Y.; Lee, S.J. Effects of Nonlinearity in the Materials Used for the Semi-Rigid Pedicle Screw Systems on Biomechanical Behaviors of the Lumbar Spine After Surgery. *Spine J.* 2011, 11, 467–475. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2011.03.013. PMID:21498138.
57. Cho, M.J.; Chung, C.K.; Kim, C.H. Screw Loosening and Migration After Dynesys Implantation. *Korean J. Spine* 2012, 9, 300–303. doi:10.14245/kjs.2012.9.3.300. PMID:25983838.
58. Galbusera, F.; Casaroli, G.; Chande, R.; Lindsey, D.; Villa, T.; Yerby, S.; Mesiwala, A.; Panico, M.; Gallazzi, E.; Brayda-Bruno, M. Biomechanics of Sacropelvic Fixation: A Comprehensive Finite Element Comparison of Three Techniques. *Eur. Spine J.* 2020, 29, 295–305. doi:10.1007/s00586-019-06225-5. PMID:31773275.
59. Cecchinato, R.; Bourghli, A.; Obeid, I. Revision Surgery of Spinal Dynamic Implants: A Literature Review and Algorithm Proposal. *Eur. Spine J.* 2020, 29, 57–65. doi:10.1007/s00586-019-06282-w. PMID:31916002.
60. Cakir, B.; Carazzo, C.; Schmidt, R.; Mattes, T.; Reichel, H.; Käfer, W. Adjacent Segment Mobility After Rigid and Semirigid Instrumentation of the Lumbar Spine. *Spine* 2009, 34, 1287–1291. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e3181a136ab. PMID:19455004.
61. Warburton, A.; Girdler, S.J.; Mikhail, C.M.; Ahn, A.; Cho, S.K. Biomaterials in Spinal Implants: A Review. *Neurospine* 2020, 17, 101–110. doi:10.14245/ns.1938296.148. PMID:31694360.
62. Malakoutian, M.; Street, J.; Wilke, H.J.; Stavness, I.; Dvorak, M.; Fels, S.; Oxland, T. Role of Muscle Damage on Loading at the Level Adjacent to a Lumbar Spine Fusion: A Biomechanical Analysis. *Eur. Spine J.* 2016, 25, 2929–2937. doi:10.1007/s00586-016-4686-y. PMID:27465240.
63. Volkheimer, D.; Malakoutian, M.; Oxland, T.R.; Wilke, H.J. Limitations of Current In Vitro Test Protocols for Investigation of Instrumented Adjacent Segment Biomechanics: Critical Analysis of the Literature. *Eur. Spine J.* 2015, 24, 1882–1892. doi:10.1007/s00586-015-4040-9. PMID:26038156.
64. Edwards, W.T. Biomechanics of Posterior Lumbar Fixation: Analysis of Testing Methodologies. *Spine* 1991, 16, 1224–1232. doi:10.1097/00007632-199110000-00016. PMID:1754942.
65. Pfeiffer, M.; Hoffman, H.; Goel, V.K.; Weinstein, J.N.; Griss, P. In Vitro Testing of a New Transpedicular Stabilization Technique. *Eur. Spine J.* 1997, 6, 249–255. doi:10.1007/BF01322447. PMID:9294750.
66. Izzo, R.; Guarnieri, G.; Guglielmi, G.; Muto, M. Biomechanics of the Spine. Part II: Spinal Instability. *Eur. J. Radiol.* 2013, 82, 127–138. doi:10.1016/j.ejrad.2012.07.023. PMID:23088878.
67. Kim, B.S.; Lim, T.H.; Kwon, T.K.; Han, K.S. Feasibility of Compressive Follower Load on Spine in a Simplified Dynamic State: A Simulation Study. *Biomed. Mater. Eng.* 2014, 24, 2319–2329. doi:10.3233/BME-141045. PMID:25226932.
68. Przybyla, A.S.; Skrzypiec, D.; Pollintine, P.; Dolan, P.; Adams, M.A. Strength of the Cervical Spine in Compression and Bending. *Spine* 2007, 32, 1612–1620. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e318074c40b. PMID:17621208.
69. Arjmand, N.; Gagnon, D.; Plamondon, A.; Shirazi-Adl, A.; Larivière, C. Comparison of Trunk Muscle Forces and Spinal Loads Estimated by Two Biomechanical Models. *Clin. Biomech.* 2010, 25, 533–541. doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2010.02.006. PMID:20347173.
70. Sung, P.S.; Danial, P.; Lee, D.C. Reliability of the Kinematic Steadiness Index During One-Leg Standing in Subjects with Recurrent Low Back Pain. *Eur. Spine J.* 2018, 27, 171–179. doi:10.1007/s00586-017-5314-1. PMID:28980075.
71. Qu, N.; Tian, H.; De Martino, E.; Zhang, B. Neck Pain: Do We Know Enough About the Sensorimotor Control System? *Front. Comput. Neurosci.* 2022, 16, 946514. doi:10.3389/fncom.2022.946514. PMID:35910451.
72. Doodkorte, R.J.P.; Roth, A.K.; Arts, J.J.; Lataster, L.M.A.; van Rhijn, L.W.; Willems, P.C. Biomechanical Comparison of Semirigid Junctional Fixation Techniques to Prevent Proximal Junctional Failure After

Thoracolumbar Adult Spinal Deformity Correction. *Spine* 2021, 46, E139–E147. doi:10.1097/BRS.0000000000003743. PMID:33273437.

73. Mendoza-Lattes, S.; Ries, Z.; Gao, Y.; Weinstein, S.L. Proximal Junctional Kyphosis in Adult Reconstructive Spine Surgery Results from Incomplete Restoration of the Lumbar Lordosis Relative to the Magnitude of the Thoracic Kyphosis. *Iowa Orthop. J.* 2011, 31, 199–206. PMID:22096439.
74. Hostin, R.; McCarthy, I.; O'Brien, M.; Bess, S.; Line, B.; Boachie-Adjei, O.; Burton, D.; Gupta, M.; Mundis, G.; Schwab, F.; Shaffrey, C.; Smith, J.; Wood, K.; Hart, R.; Klineberg, E.; Ames, C. Incidence, Mode, and Location of Acute Proximal Junctional Failures After Surgical Treatment of Adult Spinal Deformity. *Spine* 2013, 38, 1008–1015. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e318271319c. PMID:23334400.
75. Kim, H.J.; Lenke, L.G.; Shaffrey, C.I.; Van Alstyne, E.M.; Skelly, A.C. Proximal Junctional Kyphosis as a Distinct Form of Adjacent Segment Pathology After Spinal Deformity Surgery: A Systematic Review. *Spine* 2012, 37, S144–S164. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e31826d611b. PMID:23038622.
76. Yagi, M.; King, A.B.; Boachie-Adjei, O. Incidence, Risk Factors, and Natural Course of Proximal Junctional Kyphosis: Surgical Outcomes Review of Adult Idiopathic Scoliosis. Minimum 5 Years of Follow-Up. *Spine* 2012, 37, 1479–1489. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e31824e4888. PMID:22310093.
77. Arlet, V.; Aebi, M. Junctional Spinal Disorders in Operated Adult Spinal Deformities: Present Understanding and Future Perspectives. *Eur. Spine J.* 2013, 22, S276–S295. doi:10.1007/s00586-013-2677-7. PMID:23471571.
78. Schmoelz, W.; Onder, U.; Martin, A.; von Strempel, A. Non-Fusion Instrumentation of the Lumbar Spine with a Hinged Pedicle Screw Rod System: An In Vitro Experiment. *Eur. Spine J.* 2009, 18, 1478–1485. doi:10.1007/s00586-009-1052-3. PMID:19504129.
79. Más, Y.; Gracia, L.; Ibarz, E.; Gabarre, S.; Peña, D.; Herrera, A. Finite Element Simulation and Clinical Follow-Up of Lumbar Spine Biomechanics with Dynamic Fixations. *PLoS One* 2017, 12, e0188328. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0188328. PMID:29155882.
80. Kim, S.M.; Kim, Y.C.; Kim, K.T.; Ha, K.Y.; Luo, Q.; Li, X.; Park, J. Surgical Sequence in Anterior Column Realignment with Posterior Osteotomy Is Important for Degree of Adult Spinal Deformity Correction: Advantages and Indications for Posterior to Anterior Sequence. *BMC Musculoskelet. Disord.* 2022, 23, 1004. doi:10.1186/s12891-022-05915-4. PMID:36419151.
81. Harris, B.M.; Hilibrand, A.S.; Savas, P.E.; Pellegrino, A.; Vaccaro, A.R.; Siegler, S.; Albert, T.J. Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion: The Effect of Various Instrumentation Techniques on the Flexibility of the Lumbar Spine. *Spine* 2004, 29, E65–E70. doi:10.1097/01.brs.0000113034.74567.86. PMID:15094547.
82. Eysel, P.; Hopf, C.; Diop, A.; Lavaste, F. Multi-Segment Ventral Stabilization of the Lumbar Spine: A Comparative Biomechanical Study. *Z. Orthop. Ihre Grenzgeb.* 1995, 133, 242–248. doi:10.1055/s-2008-1039444. PMID:7610706.
83. Li, C.R.; Chen, S.H.; Chen, W.H.; Tsou, H.K.; Tzeng, C.Y.; Chen, T.Y.; Lin, M.S. A Retrospective Observational Study to Evaluate Adjacent Segmental Degenerative Change with the Dynesys-Transition-Optima Instrumentation System. *J. Clin. Med.* 2024, 13, 582. doi:10.3390/jcm13020582. PMID:38276088.
84. Porwal, S.; Rizvi, M.R.; Sharma, A.; Ahmad, F.; Alshahrani, M.S.; Raizah, A.; Shaik, A.R.; Seyam, M.K.; Miraj, M.; Alkhamis, B.A.; Mukherjee, D.; Ahmad, I. Enhancing Functional Ability in Chronic Nonspecific Lower Back Pain: The Impact of EMG-Guided Trunk Stabilization Exercises. *J. Clin. Med.* 2023, 12, 3423. doi:10.3390/jcm12103423. PMID:37240527.
85. Chen, X.; Kohan, S.; Bhargav, D.; Choi, J.; Perera, S.; Dean, C.; Chopra, N.; Sial, A.; Sandhu, H.S.; Apos, E.; Appleyard, R.; Diwan, A.D. Phase 1 Evaluation of an Elastomeric Nucleus Pulposus Device as an Option to Augment Disc at Microdiscectomy: Experimental Results from Biomechanical and Biocompatibility Testing and First in Human. *JOR Spine* 2023, 6, e1250. doi:10.1002/jsp2.1250. PMID:37361335.
86. Perera, K.; Ivone, R.; Natekin, E.; Wilga, C.A.; Shen, J.; Menon, J.U. 3D Bioprinted Implants for Cartilage Repair in Intervertebral Discs and Knee Menisci. *Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol.* 2021, 9, 754113. doi:10.3389/fbioe.2021.754113. PMID:34746106.

87. Yoshihara, H. Surgical Options for Lumbosacral Fusion: Biomechanical Stability, Advantage, Disadvantage and Affecting Factors in Selecting Options. *Eur. J. Orthop. Surg. Traumatol.* 2014, 24, S73–S82. doi:10.1007/s00590-013-1282-2. PMID:23860810.
88. Lang, Z.; Li, J.S.; Yang, F.; Yu, Y.; Khan, K.; Jenis, L.G.; Cha, T.D.; Kang, J.D.; Li, G. Reoperation of Decompression Alone or Decompression Plus Fusion Surgeries for Degenerative Lumbar Diseases: A Systematic Review. *Eur. Spine J.* 2019, 28, 1371–1385. doi:10.1007/s00586-018-5681-2. PMID:29956000.
89. Wang, H.; Lin, H.B. Dynamic Stabilization Devices in the Treatment of Low Back Pain. *Zhongguo Gu Shang* 2008, 21, 76–78. PMID:19102290.
90. Akamaru, T.; Kawahara, N.; Yoon, S.T.; Minamide, A.; Kim, K.S.; Tomita, K.; Hutton, W.C. Adjacent Segment Motion After a Simulated Lumbar Fusion in Different Sagittal Alignments: A Biomechanical Analysis. *Spine* 2003, 28, 1560–1566. doi:10.1097/01.BRS.0000076826.70912.0B. PMID:12865843.
91. Chou, P.H.; Lin, H.H.; An, H.S.; Liu, K.Y.; Su, W.Y.; Lin, M.C. Could the Topping-Off Technique Be the Preventive Strategy Against Adjacent Segment Disease After Pedicle Screw-Based Fusion in Lumbar Degenerative Diseases? A Systematic Review. *Biomed. Res. Int.* 2017, 2017, 4385620. doi:10.1155/2017/4385620. PMID:28303234.
92. Cheng, B.C.; Mihara, H.; David, S.M.; Zdeblick, T.A. Biomechanical Comparison of Posterior Cervical Fixation. *Spine* 2001, 26, 1662–1667. doi:10.1097/00007632-200108010-00007. PMID:11474352.
93. Weis, J.C.; Cunningham, B.W.; Kanayama, M.; Parker, L.; McAfee, P.C. In Vitro Biomechanical Comparison of Multistrand Cables with Conventional Cervical Stabilization. *Spine* 1996, 21, 2108–2114. doi:10.1097/00007632-199609150-00010. PMID:8893435.
94. Coe, J.D.; Warden, K.E.; Sutterlin, C.E.; McAfee, P.C. Biomechanical Evaluation of Cervical Spinal Stabilization Methods in a Human Cadaveric Model. *Spine* 1989, 14, 1122–1131. doi:10.1097/00007632-198910000-00016. PMID:2588063.
95. Sutterlin, C.E.; McAfee, P.C.; Warden, K.E.; Rey, R.M.; Farey, I.D. A Biomechanical Evaluation of Cervical Spinal Stabilization Methods in a Bovine Model: Static and Cyclical Loading. *Spine* 1988, 13, 795–802. doi:10.1097/00007632-198807000-00015. PMID:3187705.
96. Han, M.S.; Lee, G.J.; Kim, J.H.; Lee, S.K.; Moon, B.J.; Lee, J.K. Outcomes of Anterior Cervical Fusion Using Polyetheretherketone Cage with Demineralized Bone Matrix and Plate for Management of Subaxial Cervical Spine Injuries. *Korean J. Neurotrauma* 2018, 14, 123–128. doi:10.13004/kjnt.2018.14.2.123. PMID:30402430.
97. Herrero, C.F.; Luis do Nascimento, A.; Maranho, D.A.C.; Ferreira-Filho, N.M.; Nogueira, C.P.; Nogueira-Barbosa, M.H.; Defino, H.L.A. Cervical Pedicle Morphometry in a Latin American Population: A Brazilian Study. *Medicine* 2016, 95, e3947. doi:10.1097/MD.0000000000003947. PMID:27336889.
98. Fan, W.; Guo, L.X.; Zhao, D. Posterior Lumbar Interbody Fusion Versus Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion: Finite Element Analysis of the Vibration Characteristics of Fused Lumbar Spine. *Spine* 2021, 46, E1311–E1319. doi:10.1097/BRS.0000000000004095. PMID:34091561.
99. Fan, W.; Guo, L.X. Biomechanical Comparison of the Effects of Anterior, Posterior and Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion on Vibration Characteristics of the Human Lumbar Spine. *Comput. Methods Biomech. Biomed. Engin.* 2019, 22, 490–498. doi:10.1080/10255842.2019.1566816. PMID:30714396.
100. Hu, X.; Jiang, M.; Hong, Y.; Rong, X.; Huang, K.; Liu, H.; Pu, D.; Wang, B. Single-Level Cervical Disc Arthroplasty in the Spine with Reversible Kyphosis: A Finite Element Study. *JOR Spine* 2022, 5, e1194. doi:10.1002/jsp2.1194. PMID:35783908.
101. Ou, Y.; Xiao, Z.; Wei, J.; Jiang, H.; Li, Z. Upper and Lower Adjacent Segment Range of Motion After Fixation of Different Lumbar Spine Segments in the Goat: An In Vitro Experiment. *J. Int. Med. Res.* 2021, 49, 3000605211020219. doi:10.1177/03000605211020219. PMID:34182828.
102. Huang, C.; Liu, Z.; Wei, Z.; Fang, Z.; Xi, Z.; Cai, P.; Li, J. Will the Adjustment of Insertional Pedicle Screw Positions Affect the Risk of Adjacent Segment Diseases Biomechanically? An In-Silico Study. *Front. Surg.* 2023, 9, 1004642. doi:10.3389/fsurg.2022.1004642. PMID:36713678.
103. Jahng, T.A.; Kim, Y.E.; Moon, K.Y. Comparison of the Biomechanical Effect of Pedicle-Based Dynamic Stabilization: A Study Using Finite Element Analysis. *Spine J.* 2013, 13, 85–94. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2012.11.014. PMID:23266148.

104. Zhang, Q.H.; Teo, E.C. Finite Element Application in Implant Research for Treatment of Lumbar Degenerative Disc Disease. *Med. Eng. Phys.* 2008, 30, 1246–1256. doi:10.1016/j.medengphy.2008.06.001. PMID:18676179.
105. Schwarzenbach, O.; Berlemann, U.; Stoll, T.M.; Dubois, G. Posterior Dynamic Stabilization Systems: DYNESYS. *Orthop. Clin. North Am.* 2005, 36, 363–372. doi:10.1016/j.ocl.2005.03.001. PMID:15950696.
106. Abumi, K.; Panjabi, M.M.; Duranceau, J. Biomechanical Evaluation of Spinal Fixation Devices: III. Stability Provided by Six Spinal Fixation Devices and Interbody Bone Graft. *Spine* 1989, 14, 1249–1255. doi:10.1097/00007632-198911000-00019. PMID:2588059.
107. Blumenthal, S.; Gill, K. Complications of the Wiltse Pedicle Screw Fixation System. *Spine* 1993, 18, 1867–1871. doi:10.1097/00007632-199310000-00025. PMID:8235874.
108. Dalenberg, D.D.; Asher, M.A.; Robinson, R.G.; Jayaraman, G. The Effect of a Stiff Spinal Implant and Its Loosening on Bone Mineral Content in Canines. *Spine* 1993, 18, 1862–1866. doi:10.1097/00007632-199310000-00024. PMID:8235873.
109. Farey, I.D.; McAfee, P.C.; Gurr, K.R.; Randolph, M.A. Quantitative Histologic Study of the Influence of Spinal Instrumentation on Lumbar Fusions: A Canine Model. *J. Orthop. Res.* 1989, 7, 709–722. doi:10.1002/jor.1100070512. PMID:2760743.
110. Angst, M.; Winter, M.; Lang, M.C. Dorsal Tension Band Stabilization for the Lumbar Spine Analyzed In Vitro. *J. Biomech.* 1993, 26, 817. doi:10.1016/0021-9290(93)90483-8. PMID:8358742.
111. Vahldiek, M.J.; Panjabi, M.M. Stability Potential of Spinal Instrumentations in Tumor Vertebral Body Replacement Surgery. *Spine* 1998, 23, 543–550. doi:10.1097/00007632-199803010-00006. PMID:9530785.
112. Strauss, P.J.; Novotny, J.E.; Wilder, D.G.; Grobler, L.J.; Pope, M.H. Multidirectional Stability of the Graf System. *Spine* 1994, 19, 965–972. doi:10.1097/00007632-199404150-00015. PMID:8036488.
113. Xu, H.Z.; Wang, X.Y.; Chi, Y.L.; Zhu, Q.A.; Lin, Y.; Huang, Q.S.; Dai, L.Y. Biomechanical Comparison of Posterior Lumbar Interbody Fusion and Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion by Finite Element Analysis. *Neurosurgery* 2013, 72, 21–26. doi:10.1227/NEU.0b013e3182742a69. PMID:23147790.
114. Goel, V.K.; Konz, R.J.; Chang, H.T.; Grosland, N.M.; Weinstein, J.N.; Panjabi, M.M. Hinged-Dynamic Posterior Device Permits Greater Physiologic Motion in the Lumbar Spine Compared with a Rigid Device: A Finite Element Study. *J. Spinal Disord. Tech.* 2005, 18, 348–356. doi:10.1097/01.bsd.0000169061.62652.42. PMID:16021018.
115. Zhu, Q.; Larson, C.R.; Sjovold, S.G.; Rosler, D.M.; Keynan, O.; Wilson, D.R.; Cripton, P.A.; Oxland, T.R. Biomechanical Evaluation of the Total Facet Arthroplasty System®: 3-Dimensional Kinematics. *Spine* 2007, 32, 55–62. doi:10.1097/01.brs.0000250984.12753.0f. PMID:17202893.
116. Sjovold, S.G.; Zhu, Q.; Bowden, A.; Larson, C.R.; de Bakker, P.M.; Villarraga, M.L.; Ochoa, J.A.; Rosler, D.M.; Cripton, P.A.; Oxland, T.R. Biomechanical Evaluation of the Total Facet Arthroplasty System® (TFAS®): Loading as Compared to a Rigid Posterior Fixation System. *Eur. Spine J.* 2012, 21, 1660–1673. doi:10.1007/s00586-012-2270-7. PMID:22434476.
117. Phillips, F.M.; Tzermiadianos, M.N.; Voronov, L.I.; Havey, R.M.; Carandang, G.; Renner, S.M.; Rosler, D.M.; Ochoa, J.A.; Patwardhan, A.G. Effect of the Total Facet Arthroplasty System After Complete Laminectomy-Facetectomy on the Biomechanics of Implanted and Adjacent Segments. *Spine J.* 2009, 9, 96–102. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2008.02.008. PMID:18375188.
118. Serhan, H.; Mhatre, D.; Newton, P.; Giorgio, P.; Punjabi, M. Would CoCr Rods Provide Better Correctional Forces Than Stainless Steel or Titanium for Rigid Scoliosis Curves? *J. Spinal Disord. Tech.* 2010, 23, e70–e74. doi:10.1097/BSD.0b013e3181d3ce7f. PMID:20625303.
119. Denozière, G.; Ku, D.N. Biomechanical Comparison Between Fusion of Two Vertebrae and Implantation of an Artificial Intervertebral Disc. *J. Biomech.* 2006, 39, 766–775. doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2004.07.039. PMID:16439247.
120. Cunningham, B.W.; Hu, N.; Beatson, H.J.; Serhan, H.; Sefter, J.C.; McAfee, P.C. Revision Strategies for Single- and Two-Level Total Disc Arthroplasty Procedures: A Biomechanical Perspective. *Spine J.* 2009, 9, 735–743. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2009.04.026. PMID:19540165.

121. Galbusera, F.; Schmidt, H.; Noailly, J.; Malandrino, A.; Lacroix, D.; Wilke, H.J.; Shirazi-Adl, A. Comparison of Four Methods to Simulate Swelling in Poroviscoelastic Finite Element Models of Intervertebral Discs. *J. Mech. Behav. Biomed. Mater.* 2011, 4, 1234–1241. doi:10.1016/j.jmbbm.2011.04.008. PMID:21783127.
122. Noailly, J.; Planell, J.A.; Lacroix, D. On the Collagen Criss-Cross Angles in the Annuli Fibrosi of Lumbar Spine Finite Element Models. *Biomech. Model. Mechanobiol.* 2011, 10, 203–219. doi:10.1007/s10237-010-0227-7. PMID:20502930.
123. Little, J.P.; Adam, C.J.; Evans, J.H.; Pettet, G.J.; Pearcy, M.J. Nonlinear Finite Element Analysis of Anular Lesions in the L4/5 Intervertebral Disc. *J. Biomech.* 2007, 40, 2744–2751. doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2007.01.007. PMID:17346746.
124. Schmidt, H.; Heuer, F.; Simon, U.; Kettler, A.; Rohlmann, A.; Claes, L.; Wilke, H.J. Application of a New Calibration Method for a Three-Dimensional Finite Element Model of a Human Lumbar Annulus Fibrosus. *Clin. Biomech.* 2006, 21, 337–344. doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2005.11.009. PMID:16427164.
125. Eberlein, R.; Holzapfel, G.A.; Schulze-Bauer, C.A.J. An Automated Approach for the Parameterization of Finite Element Models of Soft Tissues: Application to the Human Annulus Fibrosus. *Comput. Methods Biomech. Biomed. Engin.* 2004, 7, 3–11. doi:10.1080/10255840410001661604. PMID:14965879.
126. Natarajan, R.N.; Williams, J.R.; Andersson, G.B.J. Modeling Changes in Intervertebral Disc Mechanics Following Partial Nucleotomy Using a Poroelastic Finite Element Model. *Spine* 2006, 31, S108–S114. doi:10.1097/01.brs.0000203873.75074.32. PMID:16540858.
127. Ferguson, S.J.; Ito, K.; Nolte, L.P. Fluid Flow and Convective Transport of Solutes Within the Intervertebral Disc. *J. Biomech.* 2004, 37, 213–221. doi:10.1016/S0021-9290(03)00250-6. PMID:14706326.
128. Iatridis, J.C.; Laible, J.P.; Krag, M.H. Influence of Fixed Charge Density Magnitude and Distribution on the Intervertebral Disc: Applications of a Poroelastic and Chemical Electric (PEACE) Model. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 2003, 125, 12–24. doi:10.1115/1.1537736. PMID:12661193.
129. Mow, V.C.; Ateshian, G.A.; Spilker, R.L. Biomechanics of Diarthrodial Joints: A Review of Twenty Years of Progress. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 1993, 115, 460–467. doi:10.1115/1.2895570. PMID:8302027.
130. Spilker, R.L.; Suh, J.K.; Mow, V.C. Effects of Friction on the Unconfined Compressive Response of Articular Cartilage: A Finite Element Analysis. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 1990, 112, 138–146. doi:10.1115/1.2891166. PMID:2345445.
131. Laible, J.P.; Pflaster, D.S.; Krag, M.H.; Simon, B.R.; Haugh, L.D. A Poroelastic-Swelling Finite Element Model with Application to the Intervertebral Disc. *Spine* 1993, 18, 659–670. doi:10.1097/00007632-199305000-00002. PMID:8516695.
132. Simon, B.R.; Wu, J.S.S.; Carlton, M.W.; Kazarian, L.E.; France, E.P.; Evans, J.H.; Zienkiewicz, O.C. Poroelastic Dynamic Structural Models of Rhesus Spinal Motion Segments. *Spine* 1985, 10, 494–507. doi:10.1097/00007632-198507000-00003. PMID:4081985.
133. Argoubi, M.; Shirazi-Adl, A. Poroelastic Creep Response Analysis of a Lumbar Motion Segment in Compression. *J. Biomech.* 1996, 29, 1331–1339. doi:10.1016/0021-9290(96)00035-8. PMID:8882227.
134. Cheung, J.T.M.; Zhang, M.; Leung, A.K.L.; Fan, Y.B. Three-Dimensional Finite Element Analysis of the Foot During Standing—A Material Sensitivity Study. *J. Biomech.* 2005, 38, 1045–1054. doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2004.05.035. PMID:15797586.
135. Wu, J.Z.; Herzog, W.; Epstein, M. Modelling of Location- and Time-Dependent Deformation of Chondrocytes During Cartilage Loading. *J. Biomech.* 1999, 32, 563–572. doi:10.1016/S0021-9290(99)00011-0. PMID:10332621.
136. Park, S.; Nicoll, S.B.; Mauck, R.L.; Ateshian, G.A. Cartilage Mechanical Response Under Dynamic Compression at Physiological Strain Rates: Experimental and Computational Validations. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 2008, 130, 021013. doi:10.1115/1.2835106. PMID:18298187.
137. Ateshian, G.A.; Warden, W.H.; Kim, J.J.; Grelsamer, R.P.; Mow, V.C. Finite Deformation Biphasic Material Properties of Bovine Articular Cartilage From Confined Compression Experiments. *J. Biomech.* 1997, 30, 1157–1164. doi:10.1016/S0021-9290(97)85606-0. PMID:9456385.
138. Mow, V.C.; Kuei, S.C.; Lai, W.M.; Armstrong, C.G. Biphasic Creep and Stress Relaxation of Articular Cartilage in Compression: Theory and Experiments. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 1980, 102, 73–84. doi:10.1115/1.3138202. PMID:7382237.

139. Brown, T.D.; Singerman, R.J. Experimental Determination of the Linear Biphasic Constitutive Coefficients of Human Fetal Proximal Femoral Chondroepiphysis. *J. Biomech.* 1986, 19, 597–605. doi:10.1016/0021-9290(86)90164-2. PMID:3771579.
140. Armstrong, C.G.; Mow, V.C. Variations in the Intrinsic Mechanical Properties of Human Articular Cartilage With Age, Degeneration, and Water Content. *J. Bone Joint Surg. Am.* 1982, 64, 88–94. doi:10.2106/00004623-198264010-00012. PMID:7054208.
141. Stolz, M.; Raiteri, R.; Daniels, A.U.; VanLandingham, M.R.; Baschong, W.; Aebi, U. Dynamic Elastic Modulus of Porcine Articular Cartilage Determined at Two Different Levels of Tissue Organization by Indentation-Type Atomic Force Microscopy. *Biophys. J.* 2004, 86, 3269–3283. doi:10.1016/S0006-3495(04)74375-9. PMID:15111436.
142. Korhonen, R.K.; Laasanen, M.S.; Töyräs, J.; Rieppo, J.; Hirvonen, J.; Helminen, H.J.; Jurvelin, J.S. Comparison of the Equilibrium Response of Articular Cartilage in Unconfined Compression, Confined Compression and Indentation. *J. Biomech.* 2002, 35, 903–909. doi:10.1016/S0021-9290(02)00052-0. PMID:12052392.
143. Jurvelin, J.S.; Buschmann, M.D.; Hunziker, E.B. Optical and Mechanical Determination of Poisson's Ratio of Adult Bovine Articular Cartilage. *J. Biomech.* 1997, 30, 235–241. doi:10.1016/S0021-9290(96)00133-9. PMID:9119823.
144. Athanasiou, K.A.; Rosenwasser, M.P.; Buckwalter, J.A.; Malinin, T.I.; Mow, V.C. Interspecies Comparisons of In Situ Intrinsic Mechanical Properties of Distal Femoral Cartilage. *J. Orthop. Res.* 1991, 9, 330–340. doi:10.1002/jor.1100090304. PMID:2010837.
145. Schinagl, R.M.; Gurskis, D.; Chen, A.C.; Sah, R.L. Depth-Dependent Confined Compression Modulus of Full-Thickness Bovine Articular Cartilage. *J. Orthop. Res.* 1997, 15, 499–506. doi:10.1002/jor.1100150404. PMID:9379259.
146. Chen, A.C.; Bae, W.C.; Schinagl, R.M.; Sah, R.L. Depth- and Strain-Dependent Mechanical and Electromechanical Properties of Full-Thickness Bovine Articular Cartilage in Confined Compression. *J. Biomech.* 2001, 34, 1–12. doi:10.1016/S0021-9290(00)00144-5. PMID:11425071.
147. Buschmann, M.D.; Soulhat, J.; Shirazi-Adl, A.; Jurvelin, J.S.; Hunziker, E.B. Confined Compression of Articular Cartilage: Linearity in Ramp and Sinusoidal Tests and the Importance of Interdigitation and Collagen Fiber Orientation. *J. Biomech.* 1998, 31, 171–178. doi:10.1016/S0021-9290(97)00117-0. PMID:9596542.
148. Li, L.P.; Soulhat, J.; Buschmann, M.D.; Shirazi-Adl, A. Nonlinear Analysis of Cartilage in Unconfined Ramp Compression Using a Fibril Reinforced Poroelastic Model. *Clin. Biomech.* 1999, 14, 673–682. doi:10.1016/S0268-0033(99)00024-1. PMID:10545619.
149. Soulhat, J.; Buschmann, M.D.; Shirazi-Adl, A. A Fibril-Network-Reinforced Biphasic Model of Cartilage in Unconfined Compression. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 1999, 121, 340–347. doi:10.1115/1.2798329. PMID:10396699.
150. Cohen, B.; Lai, W.M.; Mow, V.C. A Transversely Isotropic Biphasic Model for Unconfined Compression of Growth Plate and Chondroepiphysis. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 1998, 120, 491–496. doi:10.1115/1.2798017. PMID:10412419.
151. Huang, C.Y.; Mow, V.C.; Ateshian, G.A. The Role of Flow-Independent Viscoelasticity in the Biphasic Tensile and Compressive Responses of Articular Cartilage. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 2001, 123, 410–417. doi:10.1115/1.1395574. PMID:11694900.
152. Soltz, M.A.; Ateshian, G.A. Experimental Verification and Theoretical Prediction of Cartilage Interstitial Fluid Pressurization at an Impermeable Contact Interface in Confined Compression. *J. Biomech.* 1998, 31, 927–934. doi:10.1016/S0021-9290(98)00105-X. PMID:9840757.
153. Ateshian, G.A.; Wang, H.; Lai, W.M. The Role of Interstitial Fluid Pressurization and Surface Porosities on the Boundary Friction of Articular Cartilage. *J. Tribol.* 1998, 120, 241–248. doi:10.1115/1.2834419.
154. Mow, V.C.; Holmes, M.H.; Lai, W.M. Fluid Transport and Mechanical Properties of Articular Cartilage: A Review. *J. Biomech.* 1984, 17, 377–394. doi:10.1016/0021-9290(84)90031-9. PMID:6386804.
155. Lai, W.M.; Mow, V.C.; Roth, V. Effects of Nonlinear Strain-Dependent Permeability and Rate of Compression on the Stress Behavior of Articular Cartilage. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 1981, 103, 61–66. doi:10.1115/1.3138255. PMID:7242448.

156. Holmes, M.H.; Mow, V.C. The Nonlinear Characteristics of Soft Gels and Hydrated Connective Tissues in Ultrafiltration. *J. Biomech.* 1990, 23, 1145–1156. doi:10.1016/0021-9290(90)90007-P. PMID:2273087.
157. Mak, A.F. The Apparent Viscoelastic Behavior of Articular Cartilage—The Contributions From the Intrinsic Matrix Viscoelasticity and Interstitial Fluid Flows. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 1986, 108, 123–130. doi:10.1115/1.3138591. PMID:3736158.
158. Oloyede, A.; Broom, N.D. The Generalized Consolidation of Articular Cartilage: An Experimental Study. *Connect. Tissue Res.* 1994, 31, 171–178. doi:10.3109/03008209409005644. PMID:7532609.
159. Oloyede, A.; Broom, N.D. A Physical Model for the Time-Dependent Deformation of Articular Cartilage. *Connect. Tissue Res.* 1993, 29, 251–261. doi:10.3109/03008209309016832. PMID:8118918.
160. DiSilvestro, M.R.; Zhu, Q.; Wong, M.; Jurvelin, J.S.; Suh, J.K.F. Biphasic Poroviscoelastic Simulation of the Unconfined Compression of Articular Cartilage: I—Simultaneous Prediction of Reaction Force and Lateral Displacement. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 2001, 123, 191–197. doi:10.1115/1.1351888. PMID:11476361.
161. DiSilvestro, M.R.; Suh, J.K.F. A Cross-Validation of the Biphasic Poroviscoelastic Model of Articular Cartilage in Unconfined Compression, Indentation, and Confined Compression. *J. Biomech.* 2001, 34, 519–525. doi:10.1016/S0021-9290(00)00224-4. PMID:11266676.
162. Huang, C.Y.; Soltz, M.A.; Kopacz, M.; Mow, V.C.; Ateshian, G.A. Experimental Verification of the Roles of Intrinsic Matrix Viscoelasticity and Tension-Compression Nonlinearity in the Biphasic Response of Cartilage. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 2003, 125, 84–93. doi:10.1115/1.1534592. PMID:12661199.
163. Park, S.; Hung, C.T.; Ateshian, G.A. Mechanical Response of Bovine Articular Cartilage Under Dynamic Unconfined Compression Loading at Physiological Stress Levels. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2004, 12, 65–73. doi:10.1016/j.joca.2003.08.005. PMID:14697683.
164. Fortin, M.; Soulhat, J.; Shirazi-Adl, A.; Hunziker, E.B.; Buschmann, M.D. Unconfined Compression of Articular Cartilage: Nonlinear Behavior and Comparison With a Fibril-Reinforced Biphasic Model. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 2000, 122, 189–195. doi:10.1115/1.429641. PMID:10834159.
165. Li, L.P.; Buschmann, M.D.; Shirazi-Adl, A. The Asymmetry of Transient Response in Compression Versus Release for Cartilage in Unconfined Compression. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 2001, 123, 519–522. doi:10.1115/1.1410108. PMID:11783722.
166. Suh, J.K.; Bai, S. Finite Element Formulation of Biphasic Poroviscoelastic Model for Articular Cartilage. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 1998, 120, 195–201. doi:10.1115/1.2798302. PMID:10412381.
167. Garcia, J.J.; Altiero, N.J.; Haut, R.C. An Approach for the Stress Analysis of Transversely Isotropic Biphasic Cartilage Under Impact Loading. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 1998, 120, 608–613. doi:10.1115/1.2834752. PMID:10412453.
168. Donzelli, P.S.; Spilker, R.L. A Contact Finite Element Formulation for Biological Soft Hydrated Tissues. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng.* 1998, 153, 63–79. doi:10.1016/S0045-7825(97)00056-7.
169. Wu, J.Z.; Herzog, W. Finite Element Simulation of Location- and Time-Dependent Mechanical Behavior of Chondrocytes in Unconfined Compression Tests. *Ann. Biomed. Eng.* 2000, 28, 318–330. doi:10.1114/1.276. PMID:10784093.
170. Spilker, R.L.; Donzelli, P.S.; Mow, V.C. A Transversely Isotropic Biphasic Finite Element Model of the Meniscus. *J. Biomech.* 1992, 25, 1027–1045. doi:10.1016/0021-9290(92)90038-8. PMID:1526652.